

On Czechoslovakia:



Alexander Dubcek

How Moscow Initiated
Negotiations with Dubcek

The 14-Point 'Agreement'

Peking Assails Moscow

French CP Shifts Its Stand

Louis Aragon Demands
End to Occupation

A Criticism of Fidel Castro's Position

HOW MOSCOW INITIATED NEGOTIATIONS WITH DUBCEK AS AN "EQUAL"

[The following report appeared in the September 6 issue of the Paris daily Le Monde. The editors of that paper state that they are under obligation not to reveal the identity of the personality who gave them this account of what happened to Alexander Dubček, the general secretary of the Communist party of Czechoslovakia, on the night of August 20-21.

[The account sheds light on what the Kosygin-Brezhnev leadership mean when they speak about the "normalization" of relations between the Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia.

[As to the authenticity of the report, this is difficult to confirm. According to an account heard in Brussels, when Dubček was asked about a bandage on his forehead when he returned to Prague, he said it was nothing unusual. He had "slipped in the bathtub."

[The translation is by Intercontinental Press.]

* * *

It was still night when three Soviet security officers, revolvers in hand, accompanied by several soldiers armed with machine guns, charged out of armored cars and broke into Alexander Dubček's office. One of them tore out the telephone and another handcuffed the secretary of the Communist party of Czechoslovakia. Dubček was shocked and started to protest. He was immediately struck down. His chauffeur tried to intervene but was killed on the spot with a bullet from a revolver.

"We will kill a million Czechs if necessary," one of the officers threat-

ened, "to put an end to your counterrevolution."

After being arrested, Dubček was put in an armored car and taken under heavy guard to an airport from which a helicopter flew him to a place in Slovakia. There, with kicks and blows, he was shoved into a cellar.

A few hours later, the Soviet officers again moved their prisoner, first probably to some place in Poland and finally somewhere in the Ukraine. It was from there that he was taken three days later to Moscow to participate in the negotiations with the Soviet leaders.

During his captivity Dubček was beaten several times.

Smrkovsky, the chairman of parliament, and Cernik, the head of the government, suffered the same treatment. Cernik was half unconscious when he was thrown like a suitcase into the Soviet plane which was to bring him from Prague to somewhere in the Ukraine.

The brutal treatment and humiliation inflicted on these three Czechoslovak leaders show that the Soviets had condemned them to disappear. The Soviets were convinced that they could form a new party leadership and a new government with their own partisans. But the admirable resistance of the population and the firmness displayed by President Svoboda, who refused to negotiate at all with Brezhnev in the absence of the legal representatives of the Communist party and government of his country, forced them to change their plans.

CZECHOSLOVAK MEMORANDUM ON THE FOURTEEN-POINT "AGREEMENT"

[The following is a memorandum on the fourteen points of the "agreement" concluded in Moscow August 26 between Soviet officials and the leadership of the Czechoslovak party and government. The New York Times, which published it September 8, described it as an unofficial translation of stenographic notes taken by Czechoslovak Communist party members at briefing sessions the first week of September.]

* * *

Information for the workers of the regional and district party committees on the basic 14 points of the Moscow agreement:

1. The characteristics of the po-

litical development here. It was agreed that the course will be changed in accordance with the Soviet type of socialism.

2. The declarations of the 14th party congress are not valid.

3. The strengthening of socialism through press censorship.

4. The Soviet side requested our side to declare that there was a counterrevolution. As the result of our protest, the word "counterrevolution" was left out and it was not repeated again in the declaration.

5. The mass communications media may not speak or write against the allies.

6. We submitted a request that together with the withdrawal of the troops, the Soviet security organs also be removed. The Soviet Union did agree and changed the declaration so that together with the withdrawal of troops the other groups will also be removed.

7. The Minister of Interior, Gen. Josef Pavel, asked to be relieved from his functions because he was not ready to cooperate with the Soviet security organs.

8. Our request for reparations for damages caused by the invasion was finally couched in such a way that a commission will probably be formed consisting of representatives of the five states and us to decide what can be approved as reparations and what cannot.

9. The international situation must be adjusted in accordance with the agreement in Bratislava.

10. The issuing of a declaration that our government did not request the United Nations and will not request the United Nations to discuss our subject.

11. The questions of ministers. The release from their functions of Ota

Sik and of Prof. Jiri Hajek.

12. A declaration that our border with West Germany is not prepared for defense and must, therefore, be secured by the allies.

13. The results of the Moscow negotiations are strictly secret and will not be published.

14. The further strengthening of friendship and alliance with the Soviet Union and with the states of the socialist camp.

* * *

The following additional points were discussed:

(A) The Soviet Union requested a declaration that the persons who worked for the Soviet Union will not be persecuted.

(B) Our side requested an extra provision in the declaration that the statement that the 14th congress is not valid will be made when the foreign troops have left the country.

DEFENSE TO APPEAL CONVICTION OF BLACK PANTHER LEADER

After four days of deliberation -- an unusual length of time -- an Oakland, California, jury found Huey P. Newton, the 26-year-old leader of the Black Panthers, guilty September 8 of "voluntary manslaughter" in the death of John Frey, an Oakland policeman. Frey arrested and then shot Newton in the abdomen about 5 a.m. on October 28, 1967. According to a prosecution witness, Frey was killed by a bullet from his own revolver.

The prosecution charged the Black Panther leader with murder, with kidnapping, and with assault on another policeman, Herbert Heanes. The kidnapping charge was dropped for lack of evidence. The jury acquitted Newton of the assault charge and found him guilty of "voluntary manslaughter" instead of "murder."

Newton, who will be sentenced by Judge Monroe Friedman on September 27, now faces two to fifteen years in prison. Had he been convicted of first-degree murder, he could have been sentenced to death. Thus it is held in some circles that the jury's verdict was a victory for the defense.

The attorney for the defense, Charles Garry, who fought vigorously against the frame-up charges, took a different view of the outcome.

"I am prepared to take it to the highest court in the land," he said. "We are tremendously disappointed. The verdict makes no sense."

The trial, which began July 15, was marked by a repressive atmosphere. Newton was brought to the sessions in handcuffs which were not removed until he had passed through the door. Armed guards were stationed everywhere. Spectators, reporters and witnesses were searched by police each time they entered.

In the attendant publicity, the political views of the Black Panthers came under virulent attack in the capitalist press.

Huey Newton conducted himself in exemplary fashion throughout the proceedings in which his life was at stake. In an interview September 7, while the jury was still deliberating, he reaffirmed his revolutionary views.

"We feel it necessary to prepare the people for the event of an actual physical rebellion," he said. The Black Panthers seek to advance the struggle of the black people on current issues and "at the same time prepare them for what we feel is inevitable to come and that is an armed rebellion."

FRENCH CP SQUIRMS OVER CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Paris

SEPTEMBER 4 -- As is known, the PCF [Parti Communiste Français -- French Communist party] leadership expressed its reproof and later its disapproval of the military intervention in Czechoslovakia. The importance of this fact has been widely stressed because among the large Communist parties in the capitalist world (there are few left) the French Communist party has practically never dissociated itself from the Kremlin's policy. This fact needed to be taken note of and will not be without significance for the party in the future. However, in order to understand the PCF leadership's position, its statements on Czechoslovakia must be examined more closely.

The Political Bureau took a stand as soon as the invasion was known, on the afternoon of August 21. Less than forty-eight hours later a Central Committee meeting upheld the Political Bureau's position.

But on August 27, it was learned that an "agreement" had been concluded in Moscow between the Soviet authorities and the Czechoslovaks, that is the Dubček team. As soon as the Tass communiqué was known, the Political Bureau of the PCF made a statement, the gist of which is as follows:

"Having disapproved of the military intervention and taken a stand for a solution involving a normalization of the situation in Czechoslovakia consistent with the sovereignty of the Czechoslovak government and Communist party as well as their international obligations, the French Communist party, its Central Committee, and its Political Bureau greet the conclusion of an agreement as positive. The Political Bureau will give a more detailed evaluation at a later time, on the basis of a close study of the provisions of this agreement and the information available."

One might think that the nature of the "agreement" concluded in Moscow could have been grasped at once just by reading the Tass communiqué. However, let us concede that the Political Bureau considered it advisable to take time to come out with a more rounded judgment. It should be noted that it took six days, almost a week, for the Political Bureau to adopt a new statement on September 2 -- three to four times longer than the preceding one. But although it was longer it was no more explicit than the previous one on the essential questions raised by the Moscow "agreement" and its application in Czechoslovakia. This statement resembles the "textes de synthèse" [summaries] which

Socialists, Radicals, and others often produce in their congresses in sidestepping the real problems and which in French political jargon are called "Negroes in whiteface."

Of course, in this new declaration the Political Bureau recalled its previous stands (disapproval of the military intervention, acknowledgment that the agreement was positive). But then it was careful not to examine the real substance of the "agreement" as it emerges without the slightest ambiguity from what is in fact happening in Czechoslovakia: stationing occupation troops there indefinitely, introducing censorship, changing the composition of the leading party and state bodies, etc.

The Political Bureau cannot claim that it is unaware of speeches like Smrkovsky's from which it can be seen without the shadow of a doubt that the Czechoslovak "delegates" were outrageously and brutally treated and that they were taken from Prague not as "delegates" but as prisoners -- that they only became "delegates" because Moscow couldn't come up with a Quisling, not even among those who were supposed to have signed the appeal for military intervention.

It is now clear to all with eyes to see that there was no "agreement" in Moscow but a diktat imposed by duress which every militant worker devoted to the cause of socialism must consider has no validity either for the Czechoslovak workers or the workers of the entire world. But the Political Bureau reacted to it as if it were an agreement in good and proper form:

"This examination reveals that the two parties expressed their determination to abide by the principles of Bratislava. The Czechoslovak CP affirmed its intention to defend the bases and conquests of socialism and to remain faithful to its commitments to the Warsaw Pact. The CP of the Soviet Union, on the other hand, declared that the forces it used in the intervention would be progressively withdrawn, that they would not interfere in Czechoslovak internal affairs, and that cooperation between the two countries would be carried on in mutual respect for the equality, the territorial integrity, the independence, and the solidarity of the socialist countries."

Thus, the Political Bureau took a phony diplomatic document for good coin and held back from denouncing the hypocrisy of these Kremlin leaders who, after ordering the invasion of Czechoslovakia, forced that country's imprisoned leaders to sign a document speaking

in terms of mutual independence, equal rights, etc.

Far from denouncing the diktat, from demanding immediate and unconditional withdrawal, the Political Bureau "wishes...the agreement to be applied" and promises to do "everything in its power to promote genuine and rapid implementation of the agreement."

There is, to be sure, a seemingly less formal short paragraph in favor of the Czechoslovaks:

"It [the Political Bureau] extends its fraternal support to the efforts made ...in a responsible spirit by the Czechoslovak party and state leaders."

But a paragraph follows which more than any other defines the limits of the Political Bureau's disapproval of the Soviet leaders:

"It again expresses its resolution to continue working to strengthen the unity of the international Communist movement and its own relationship of friendship and solidarity with all its sister parties, especially with the CP of the Soviet Union, on the basis of equal rights, the self-determination of every party, of Marxism-Leninism, and proletarian internationalism."

In spite of its disapproval of the military intervention, the PCF leadership is a long way from the positions taken by the leadership of the Italian CP. The position of these leaders severely condemns the Soviet government's action in its entirety, including actions after the "agreement" was signed, and challenges the Soviet leadership's role in the workers movement of today.

We know that the Italian leadership is evolving to the right, toward a more extreme "Social Democratization." But in any case the Italian leaders have raised the question of the Soviet bureaucracy's, of the Kremlin's role. This question must be discussed very widely; but the PCF leadership is trying to sidestep it.

After the invasion of Czechoslovakia, to discuss "equal rights" of parties, "free determination" for every party, and "proletarian internationalism" with the heads of the Kremlin means literally to hold the workers in contempt. "Equality," "free determination," etc. -- with armored divisions on the Soviet CP's side! Thus, we seem to have "peaceful and parliamentary roads" for the passage from capitalism to socialism, and Soviet tanks to change the leadership of a Communist party and the government of a workers state. This must be a new "Marxist-Leninist" thesis formulated by Brezhnev and

company. Who said that the present Kremlin leadership was incapable of offering anything new in the field of "theory"?

But let us come back to the PCF leadership. If there is any doubt left after reading the lines quoted above that the PCF leadership declared its disapproval of the military intervention literally with its back to the wall and primarily to preserve its relations with the Socialist party and the FGDS [Fédération de la Gauche Démocrate et Socialiste -- Federation of the Democratic and Socialist Left -- a coalition of liberals and right-wing Social Democrats], if there is any doubt that despite its expression of disapproval it hopes the intervention will be forgotten with time like the one in Hungary, if there is any doubt about this, its condemnation of Garaudy should make it clear.

The Political Bureau publicly and categorically disavowed the statements that Garaudy made on his own responsibility, although he is a member of the Political Bureau, in which he told the Soviet leaders to "resign!" The Political Bureau saw in these remarks "interference" in the internal life of another party. Of course Garaudy has no tanks with which to convert his words into action.

We said above that the Political Bureau's September 2 statement was a "Negro in whiteface." It is now well known that there are disagreements among the PCF leaders. Some remain unswervingly loyal to the Kremlin and have declared their disapproval of its action only because they could not do otherwise if they wanted to continue seeking an agreement with Guy Mollet, Mitterrand, etc. Others wanted to strike out more boldly on the road the Italian CP is following. And Waldeck Rochet is trying to keep them all together through resolutions and formulas like the one described above.

The PCF was particularly proud of its monolithism, of its roots in the working class -- it was the workers party -- of the place it continued to occupy in the French political arena despite its setbacks. But in 1968 it was shaken by blows which came on top of a long molecular process of many years duration in which it had lost the powerful positions it held at the time of the Liberation.

It thought it could recover these positions through judicious tactics in the direction of the FGDS aimed at reaching a joint program and an alliance which would lead to an electoral victory and a coalition government with that formation. But the events of May 1968 showed that for the first time it had been dangerously outflanked to the left, that it had lost control of broad strata, of the youth in particular, who were seeking a revolutionary

program.

Moreover, de Gaulle exploited these events to inflict a heavy electoral defeat on the FGDS-PCF alliance, thus exposing the illusory character of the electoralist policy followed by the PCF. And now the Czechoslovak events have strained the PCF leadership's ties with Moscow. There is no longer the total subordination of Stalin's time but a close association whose primary effect is to give the PCF a sort of aura emanating from the first workers state, which was created by the October revolution.

Mighty events of this sort have exposed the PCF to attack on both its right and left flanks. On the one hand, it has less and less hope of regaining its positions among the youth; on the other hand, those currents within it that want an Italian orientation will press forward

with more force.

Guy Mollet has exploited this second tendency with an incomparable slickness. Although he is well aware of the reasons for Waldeck Rochet's balancing act, he pretends not to see it. Making no overt criticism of the PCF leadership's statements, he notes only that while there is still a long road ahead before the "Tour split" (the congress where the CP was formed in 1920 by a split from the Socialist party) is healed, progress has been made in that direction.

Waldeck Rochet's policy both as regards French politics and the international Communist movement has no future.

After May 1968 and the invasion of Czechoslovakia, a major crisis in the PCF cannot be far off.

THE MAOIST POSITION ON THE SOVIET BLOW AGAINST CZECHOSLOVAKIA

[The following document, "Washington and Moscow Collaborate as Well as Contend over Czechoslovakia," states the Maoist position on the Soviet invasion and occupation of Czechoslovakia. It appeared as a Hsinhua report August 25 and was reprinted in the August 30 issue of Peking Review, indicating that it represents the official view.]

* * *

The armed occupation of Czechoslovakia by the Soviet revisionist renegade clique has irritated U.S. imperialism. While bringing pressure to bear on the Soviet revisionists, U.S. imperialism has hastened to declare that it would not renounce its collaboration with them merely on this account.

Late at night on August 20, just as the Soviet revisionist renegade clique began sending troops to invade Czechoslovakia, it immediately informed the chieftain of U.S. imperialism, Lyndon Johnson, of this move through Dobrynin, its ambassador to the United States. On the same night, Johnson called an emergency meeting of the National Security Council, the highest U.S. policy-making body, and issued a statement himself on August 21 denouncing the dispatch of troops by the Soviet revisionists and calling on "the Soviet Union and its associates to withdraw their troops from Czechoslovakia."

Dean Rusk, another chieftain of U.S. imperialism, declared with a threatening note at his August 22 press conference that the United States believed that the Soviet revisionists' military occupation of Czechoslovakia "cannot help but

damage" relations between the United States and the Soviet Union. He asked the Soviet revisionist renegade clique to "have second or third thoughts about this."

He also asked the Soviet revisionists to act with "moderation" in regard to the chieftains of the Dubček revisionist clique and "not to engage in punitive or excessive measures" against them, thus coming out openly to bolster up the Czechoslovak revisionist clique.

In addition, the United States mustered its Western allies to "condemn" the Soviet revisionists in the U.N. Security Council, a tool of the United States, and to call on the Soviet revisionists "forthwith to withdraw" their invasion forces.

On the other hand, U.S. official mouthpieces and propaganda machinery in the pay of the U.S. Government have again and again spread the word that the armed occupation would not affect the global counter-revolutionary collaboration between the United States and the Soviet Union.

Immediately after reading out Johnson's statement on August 21, a White House spokesman stressed that "I don't know of any change of the President's very earnest desire" to step up U.S.-Soviet collaboration. On the same day, a U.S. news agency report said that although the invasion would have a "disturbing influence" on U.S.-Soviet relations, it would not necessarily mean a suspension of all efforts to improve these relations. The United States, it said, has no intention of abandoning efforts to start talks on

"nuclear missile limitations" and other matters.

In the dogfight between the Soviet and the Czechoslovak revisionist renegade cliques, U.S. imperialism has always supported the Dubček clique to free itself from the control of the Soviet revisionists and throw itself into the hands of the Western imperialist bloc headed by the United States. At the end of last April, U.S. Under-Secretary of State Eugene V. Rostow, one of the policy-makers of U.S. ruling circles, stressed in a public address that the United States was watching "with sympathy and hope" how Czechoslovakia was "improving the political atmosphere." To encourage the Dubček clique to throw in its lot with the United States as soon as possible, he purposely indicated that the United States "will never be slow in responding." Immediately after his speech, the U.S. State Department issued an official statement saying that the United States "is watching with interest and sympathy the developments in Czechoslovakia" and hoped that "they -- the developments -- will lead to an improvement in relations between Czechoslovakia and the United States."

The statement hinted clearly that, as an inducement, Washington might consider giving the Dubček clique financial and economic benefits.

However, at a time when the revolutionary tide of the world's people is surging forward and when U.S. imperialism is riddled with internal and external crises and in an unprecedentedly difficult position, the United States needs the Soviet revisionist renegade clique to serve as its counter-revolutionary accomplice more urgently than ever before.

In fact, this clique has been doing its utmost to help U.S. imperialism in this respect. Therefore, U.S. ruling circles, proceeding from their counter-revolutionary global interests, have to act with restraint in supporting, instigating and inducing the Czechoslovak revisionists to lean to the side of the Western bloc.

They do not want anything to interfere with the fundamental interests of their counter-revolutionary global collaboration with the Soviet revisionists. It was precisely out of this consideration that the U.S. imperialist propaganda machine, while applauding and abetting the Dubček clique most vociferously not long ago in its act of betrayal and encouraging it to firmly follow the road of "liberalization," over and over hinted that it should remain "cool," "flexible" and act with "discretion" so that the Soviet revisionists would not lose their tempers and resort to military action.

Since the Brezhnev-Kosygin renegade clique came into power, especially since the sinister Glassboro meeting between Johnson and Kosygin in June last year, the Soviet revisionist renegade clique has redoubled its efforts to carry out its counter-revolutionary policy of collaboration with the United States for world domination. And it has since speeded up its collusion with U.S. imperialism in a vain attempt to redivide the world.

Like other imperialists, the Soviet revisionists play naked big-power politics, using the sovereign rights and interests of other countries controlled by them as chips for deals with U.S. imperialism. On a series of important international questions, including Vietnam, the Middle East and a so-called "nuclear disarmament," they either arrived at a tacit understanding with U.S. imperialism beforehand or clinched agreements afterwards; in other words, these two have the final say.

There were signs that the Soviet revisionists' armed occupation of Czechoslovakia was carried out with tacit U.S. consent. U.S. bourgeois papers admitted frankly that the United States had been acquainted by the Soviet revisionists with the fact that they were sending troops into Czechoslovakia and that this had the tacit consent of the United States. After the armed aggression took place, U.S. officials had more than once linked the Czechoslovak situation with the Vietnam question and expressed the "hope" that "the Czechoslovak crisis might be 'compartmentalized'" by the Soviet revisionists as "the Americans tried to do with Vietnam."

In its commentary, the British newspaper Guardian did not mince words when it pointed out that U.S. reactions to the Soviet revisionists' armed invasion of Czechoslovakia showed that there was a "tacit understanding" between "Washington and Moscow" and that "the U.S. was prepared to give Russia 'carte blanche' in Czechoslovakia, just as Russia had given the U.S. 'carte blanche' in Vietnam."

It is quite clear that on the Czechoslovak question, just as on other important international problems, there looms the plot of U.S.-Soviet collaboration and behind-the-scene deal.

On the Czechoslovak question, the United States and the Soviet Union have put on a shabby show, fighting each other on the one hand and collaborating on the other. It fully exposes their imperialist nature of close collaboration in a vain attempt to dominate the world. However, as the revolutionary struggle of the people of the world is surging forward vigorously, the more shabby shows they stage, the sooner will they meet their doom.

ANTIWAR STRUGGLE IN JAPAN: AN INTERVIEW WITH NARITA FARMERS

By Fred Halstead

[The following interview was obtained by Fred Halstead, Socialist Workers party candidate for U.S. president, while in Japan at the beginning of August as part of a world political tour.]

* * *

This is an interview I had with two farmers who are involved in the Narita airport struggle. I met them when they came to a meeting in Osaka August 4 to appeal for support.

Narita is about forty kilometers east of Tokyo and it is the site which has been chosen by the government for building a new Tokyo International Airport. The present Tokyo International Airport is at Haneda and is said to be inadequate. But the Narita airport plans call for it to handle the SST, which Lyndon Johnson boasted would allow the U.S. to send whole army units in a single plane. The building of the Narita airport is commonly understood in Japan to mean the expansion of U.S. military airpower here.

The two farmers I talked to were Mr. Akiba, twenty-four years old, and Mr. Yanagawa, twenty. Their farms would be eliminated by the airport. These farms are small by U.S. standards, but not for Japan.

Though most farms here are small, they are not unmechanized as is the case with small farms in less industrially advanced countries. Large equipment such as tractors and combines is not used, but neither are draft animals. All sorts of products of modern industry are used, however, such as pumps, sprayers, plastic, pipe, hoses, nets, racks, concrete drainage ditches and so on, and the yield is high.

Mr. Akiba said he had been born on his family's farm at Narita and after high school had gone to work in an office. When the Narita struggle began, however, he went back to the farm. Mr. Yanagawa said he had lived on his family's farm all his life.

* * *

Question: When did the Narita struggle begin?

Answer: July 4, 1967, when the government announced it would build an airport in Narita.

Q: Why were you opposed to the building of this airport?

A: At first because the government was going to take our land and we can't get farms easily elsewhere, if at all. At present we think Narita airport will be turned into a military base and will be used by the U.S. imperialists to suppress peoples in Vietnam and other underdeveloped countries, and even in Japan.

Q: How many farmers would lose their land if the airport were built?

A: Three hundred families. It is a big airport. The government said it will pay, but the real value is about two-and-a-half times what was offered. That is what you have to pay right now to buy such land. The government wants to take the land by decree at the lower price.

Q: How did the farmers begin to resist?

A: We had a sit-in at the office of the prefecture [similar to a county in the U.S.] of Chiba, in which Narita is located. We had a series of three such demonstrations. This was first organized by the Youth Bund of Action which formed for this struggle. After that a Hantei Domei [Alliance of Protest] was organized which included the members of the Socialist party and Communist party who lived in Narita.

Q: What happened next?

A: Some people did not want to carry the fight except through the courts, which could only delay eviction, not stop it. There is a sect called the Hito Subo movement which has this view. Some thought the struggle should be fought through the Diet [parliament]. These were also the positions of the Communist party and the Socialist party. But 300 farmers cannot change the Diet. We had to resist in action and hope for help from the people.

Q: When did the resistance begin?

A: On October 10, 1967, the government began to measure the land. At that time the Hantei Domei was coordinated by the Communist party. But whenever the farmers gathered where the measurement was going on or even to meet, the police broke them up on such excuses as blocking traffic. They broke us up with clubs.

The Communist party said if we used self-defense to maintain our gatherings, the Hantei Domei would be crushed. They said the government was too powerful and we should follow the policy of Hito Subo. So we broke with that leadership

and policy and developed a line of physical self-defense.

The farmers armed themselves, mostly with sickles and sharpened bamboo poles. Now if police come to arrest people or break us up, the farmers take weapons and fight.

Q: What was the Socialist party's position on this?

A: The same as the Communist party, but some SP members helped us prepare to fight.

Q: Did you fight alone?

A: Oh, no. We sought alliance with Zengakuren and young militant workers. Some labor unions came to help. The main clash occurred July 17 of this year.

The farmers, militant workers in the Antiwar Youth Committee, Zengakuren, and the union people gathered. For ten hours they confronted the police. Six hundred farmers and allies, and 1,000 police. Then the clash, which lasted perhaps ten minutes. There were three clashes, and on the last the police took the barricade and scattered us. Then they finished the

last measurement inside a circle of police.

Q: Then what happened?

A: Now they await the final stage, construction, and for that they must evict. They are boring now to test the substrata. But because we fought, our cause is known throughout Japan. At present, the police do not appear in the district. The airport people do not appear. Now the Hantei Domei has confirmed the position that it will continue the struggle with barricades and stop the boring. We are preparing, mainly now by making alliances with militants, with the students and the workers. The police are preparing too. They are being issued iron poles to use against us, instead of wooden ones.

Q: My final question: If the government paid you the full value of the land, what would you do?

A: We would not accept. We would continue our struggle to keep our farms. This is not just a matter of the difference in price. It is a question of imperialism. We are not going to let them use our land as a base against the Vietnamese or any other farmers and workers.

MAURICE SPECTOR -- PIONEER CANADIAN TROTSKYIST

By Ross Dowson

[The following article is taken from the August 26 issue of the Toronto biweekly, Workers Vanguard.]

* * *

In New York City, on August 1, Maurice Spector died of cancer. He was 70 years old. His name is not now known by many but it already has an imperishable place and is certain to have a pre-eminent one when the true history of the working-class struggles in Canada and indeed the rest of the world is written.

Maurice Spector was a founding leader of the Communist Party of Canada, and when that party succumbed to Stalinism he became the pioneer of its continuator, the Trotskyist movement, organized today in the League for Socialist Action -- Ligue Socialiste Ouvrière. Further, he played a key role at a crucial period in the international socialist movement by helping to make available to the world the ideas of Leon Trotsky and the Russian Left Opposition, whose efforts to uphold the principles of proletarian democracy and international socialism were being foully maligned and murderously crushed by the bureaucratic forces that had fastened themselves on the first workers

state in the USSR.

As the early Communist Party's outstanding theoretician, orator and publicist, Spector accompanied the party's founding secretary Jack MacDonald to the Sixth Congress of the Communist International in 1928. There he was elected to the Executive Committee of the Comintern -- the first Canadian to achieve that position. As a member of the program commission, he and James P. Cannon, a leader of the Communist Party of the United States, accidentally secured a copy of Leon Trotsky's Criticism of the Draft Program of the Communist International. Trotsky had already been expelled from the CPSU and this document was kept from most of the delegates. Aware of the great significance of Trotsky's views, Spector and Cannon decided to smuggle the document out of the Soviet Union and conduct a common struggle for its ideas in their respective parties.

Shortly after returning to America, they and their first handful of supporters were expelled without debate. At first they functioned as a left opposition attempting to reform the Communist party. In 1934, following the destruction of the German CP without any serious resistance,

they began, in alliance with widening forces around the world, to rebuild the revolutionary socialist movement from scratch.

Spector's identity with Trotsky's struggle was by no means accidental. He was always profoundly worldwide in his outlook. While at high school he developed an intense interest in socialism. He quickly found his way to those socialists in the Toronto area who adhered to an internationalist position and opposed World War I. The news of the Russian Revolution was having a stirring effect on an important group of socialists with whom in 1920 he helped found the Plebs League of Ontario. Despite his youth he was on the executive and quickly became known as a leading speaker.

With the encouragement of the Comintern, the Plebs League, together with the Toronto Workers Educational College headed by Jack MacDonald, and some Ukrainian and Finnish-language organizations, formed the main forces that came together in Guelph in 1921 to found the Communist Party of Canada.

While only 23 years of age, Spector was elected to the executive committee and appointed to a three-man press committee. He edited the first issue of the party's underground paper, The Communist. With the emergence of the open Workers Party the following year, he was made the party's chairman and attended the Fourth World Congress of the Communist International as its delegate.

While the horizon of the majority of his comrades tended to be limited to the immediate tasks at hand, Spector always retained an intense interest in the revolution unfolding across the globe. In 1923, at the height of a revolutionary rebirth in Germany, Spector decided that an experience there would be of great value to the Canadian movement when the revolutionary wave advanced to North America.

Spector's experience in Germany led him to anticipate the identical thesis as to the cause of the defeat that was put forward by Trotsky in his introduction to Lessons of October.

Before returning to Canada in the spring of 1924, Spector went to Moscow to attend the Second All-Union Congress of Soviets where he became acquainted to some degree with the struggle that had been raging in the CPSU. Spector's ac-

quaintance with some of the issues at stake and his authority amongst his comrades resulted in the Canadian party being the only one in the world to oppose the attacks being made on Trotsky and the Left Opposition. When its delegate to the Fifth plenum of the ECCI asked for instructions as to the position he should take on the question of Trotskyism, the Canadian central executive committee wired its opposition to the attacks on Trotsky.

When Tim Buck at the Seventh plenum of the ECCI committed the Canadian party to Stalin, to a policy of denunciation of the Left Opposition, Spector offered to resign. But with the support of MacDonald he retained his position as party chairman and editor of The Worker.

Soon after the New Year, 1926, Spector had an opportunity to attend a plenum of the U.S. party where he learned of James P. Cannon's uneasiness about events in the USSR. He singled him out to express his support of Trotsky. They parted with no commitments as to what to do but with a certain bond of understanding. Their unity was cemented when, at the Sixth Congress, they were able to acquaint themselves with Trotsky's rounded view.

The instant expulsion of Cannon and his supporters from the U.S. party was used to force a sudden showdown with Spector who was summarily expelled. Immediately a massive campaign was launched to isolate him but Spector responded with an aggressive campaign of a public character. Within a short while the former chairman of the party and its leading theoretician was joined by its founding national secretary. Together Spector and MacDonald commenced the colossal task of rebuilding the movement.

In 1936 Spector went to New York to participate more closely with the leaders of the American Trotskyist movement. The constant harassment and the enormous difficulties of the work, together with the monstrous murder of the entire Bolshevik leadership through the Moscow frame-up trials, disheartened him and he quietly withdrew from political activity.

Although Spector left its ranks over thirty years ago, his contribution to the development, the defence and the regeneration of revolutionary Marxism was a monumental one.

CZECHOSLOVAK STAND BRINGS REPRISAL ON LUXEMBOURG CP COUNCILORS

Sixty city councilors of Sassenheim and Differdange demanded that their Communist colleagues resign when the Lux-

embourg Communist party, in the only action of its kind in Western Europe, backed the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia.

LOUIS ARAGON DEMANDS IMMEDIATE END TO SOVIET OCCUPATION

The turmoil among French Communist intellectuals over the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia appears to be deepening. Following Roger Garaudy's public demand that the Soviet leaders resign [see Intercontinental Press, September 9, p. 742], Louis Aragon, the elder statesman of the French Communist intellectual world and a member of the Central Committee of the Communist party, has come out strongly against the Soviet action.

The September 2 issue of Les Lettres Françaises, which is edited by Aragon, carried a front-page editorial, over the signature of the weekly, upholding the right of the Czechoslovak people to exercise their sovereignty.

"We must admit," declared the editorial, "that what we wished to believe last week about the fate of Czechoslovakia did not come about. The occupation has become established. We cannot conceive of socialism assuming the face of military duress, of the law of the mighty, of censorship, of repression.

"In a country like ours, with old colonies, we saw for too long in our own experience in regard to Vietnam and again Algeria the truth of Marx's statement that a people that oppresses another is not a free people. We know what defensive and disarming masks this oppression can assume. We know also that it was in the name of this freedom, which Marx provided the key to understanding, in the name of the values that guided the peoples' struggle against Hitler, that a new Europe could be built through the sacrifice of millions of men and women.

"How can this new Europe be defended in opposition to this freedom and these values? The confidence of the peoples is worth more than the strongest fortress.

"Czechoslovak brothers, we support your struggle to secure for your country a future and a kind of socialism worthy of it. We will not forget you because in our eyes the prerequisite for a détente and peace in Europe and our own social progress is the restoration of your sovereignty.

"Who could endure an occupied Czechoslovakia on the thirtieth anniversary of Munich?

"It is difficult as we go to press to comment on the reports coming out of Czechoslovakia because there is no way to confirm them. We would hope, however, that this time we will not find intellectuals once again being made the scapegoats."

Les Lettres Françaises also published a press release from the Comité des Ecrivains [Writers Committee], signed by Aragon, his wife Elsa Triolet, Vladimir Pozner, Jacques Madaule, and Alain Prévost. This called for "immediately withdrawing the occupation troops" and permitting the government chosen by the Czechoslovak people to freely function.

Moscow replied in the September 4 issue of Literaturnaya Gazeta:

"Only politically myopic people could place on the same plane, if only indirectly, Hitler's occupation of France and the aid brought by the troops of the allied countries to the Czechoslovak people in their struggle against the counterrevolution. That is why the proposals that have been advanced over the signatures of Louis Aragon and others sound like a sacrilege, or rather like an insult to the memory of the founder of Les Lettres Françaises, Jacques Decour, to the memory of Gabriel Péri, Jean Prévost and other French writers, loyal friends of the Soviet Union, who fell under the blows of the fascist butchers.

"We would hope that this declaration by Louis Aragon, Elsa Triolet, and others is only a passing error. Louis Aragon has been known to revise his positions in the past.*

"At the time of the fascist uprising in Hungary, some French progressive intellectuals adopted a rather inconsistent position. But later -- silently or publicly, each according to his own conscience--they recognized their error. Must they repeat these errors over and over again? Wouldn't it be better for them to be less hasty so that they won't look ridiculous later on when they have to acknowledge their errors?"

* This can hardly be denied. The 71-year-old poet and novelist was -- like the present rulers in the Kremlin -- a lyrical and eloquent sycophant of Stalin. Aragon has had much to repent.

JOHNSON USES CZECHOSLOVAKIA AS EXCUSE TO HEAT UP THE COLD WAR

Washington has lost no time in putting the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia to good use as a pretext for heating up the Cold War. Secretary of Defense Clark Clifford spelled out the first moves in a talk at a luncheon of the National Press Club September 5.

Clifford said that a "new imbalance" of forces in Central Europe would "require" the United States to abandon plans for a cutback in U.S. armed forces stationed in NATO countries.

"The events of the past couple of weeks, I submit," Clifford said, "have clearly demonstrated that a significant American military presence in Western Europe is still needed."

The imperialist spokesman declared that budget cuts, promised by Johnson at the time he announced his early retirement, would not be applied to the proposed Sentinel missile system, which has been under attack even within Congress.

"When and if we negotiate," he added, "safety and success demand that we negotiate from strength."

During the luncheon Clifford also indicated that it didn't make much difference to him who was elected in November -- he was bucking to keep his job under either Humphrey or Nixon.

As a smooth publicity expert, he of course gave his bid a patriotic tinge: "As long as the President of the United States wishes me to stay in this position, I will do so."



CLARK CLIFFORD

CZECHOSLOVAK CRISIS DEEPENS SPLIT IN GREEK COMMUNIST PARTY

The Greek Communist party, already badly split, has become further divided as a result of the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia. The Political Bureau, headed by Koliyannis, approved the intervention and the Kremlin's arguments without any reservations.

The authority of the Political Bureau is contested by the Central Committee. This body, headed by Partsalides, who was a member of the Political Bureau until February 1968 when the split occurred, has taken an opposite stand.

In a statement issued August 23, Partsalides voiced support for the Czechoslovak people, their state and their party leaders.

"The military intervention in Czechoslovakia," he said, "constitutes an act contrary to the principles which must regulate the relations between Communist parties.

"It undermines the unity of the international Communist movement. It deals an additional blow to struggles like that of the Greek people against regimes set up by material force and by foreign imperialist intervention...

"We Greek Communists have learned well through our own experience what immense damage the violation of the principles of autonomy and nonintervention in the internal affairs of another party can cause to the Communist movement...."

STOKELY CARMICHAEL SPEAKS AT ARAB STUDENT CONVENTION

By Jan Garrett

Ann Arbor, Michigan

"The Arabs stand firmly in the trenches of the colored peoples, of the oppressed peoples of the world," declared Ziyad Husami, outgoing president of the Organization of Arab Students in the U.S. and Canada, at his address at the opening banquet of the organization's convention, which was held here August 25-31.

Attending were three to four hundred Arab students from North American universities and colleges and invited guests from fraternal organizations, including the Organization of Syrian Students (based in Syria), the Iranian Students' Association in the U.S., the U.S. Young Socialist Alliance, and the Black Panther party.

In an incisive analysis entitled "Reflections on the State of the Arab Nation," Husami outlined a strategy for the pan-Arab struggle for liberation: the Arab revolution must seek allies among oppressed peoples on all continents, he said. The Organization of Arab Students calls for the formation of people's militias in the Arab states to enable the peasants and workers to challenge the authoritarian structures with arms in hand. "A cry for the heaven-sent savior is a cry of futility," he declared, as he pointed out the duty of the Arab intelligentsia to assist in the construction of a revolutionary pan-Arab party based on the masses.

Solidarizing his organization with the revolutionary war being waged by Al Fatah, the militant Palestinian guerrilla group, aimed at the destruction of the racist Israeli state, Husami emphasized that the goal of the struggle was to establish "a multiethnic society in Palestine, free from the exploitation of man by man" -- a socialist Palestine in a "free, socialist and unified Arab East."

Husami introduced the keynote speaker, Stokely Carmichael, prime minister of the Black Panther party, as a representative of "the most revolutionary party in the United States." He pointed out that the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee had opposed the 1967 Israeli aggression before being contacted by the Arab students. This fact, Husami said, testifies to the close spiritual ties between the oppressed blacks and the oppressed Arab nation.

Both Husami and Carmichael received a standing ovation.

Carmichael described the evolution of the black nationalist position on the Arab-Israeli conflict and explained his



STOKELY CARMICHAEL

experiences in countering the Zionist propaganda offensive in this country. Like Husami, he stressed the international and anticapitalist character of the liberation fight.

The banquet was the high point of the English-language section of the week-long convention, a gathering which reflected the deep radicalization of the Arab students since the June 1967 war. Exceptionally well organized, the convention devoted a day and a half to a lecture-discussion series on the origins, intellectual and social, of Zionism and the Israeli state. These were led by Dr. Fayez Sayegh, the learned Arab scholar and political commentator. Another day was spent on aspects of the anti-imperialist struggles in Vietnam, Cuba and the Arab world. Authors Paul Sweezy and Eqbal Ahmad participated in these sessions. The tactics and strategy of the Arab liberation struggle were discussed in Arabic in a further session.

AN INTERVIEW WITH HUGO BLANCO IN EL FRONTON PRISON

[The following is an interview with the Peruvian revolutionary leader Hugo Blanco obtained by a representative of the Comité de Defensa de los Derechos Humanos -- CODDEH -- (the Committee for the Defense of Human Rights) on the island prison of El Frontón. The interview was given in the last week of May. It has been translated by Intercontinental Press from the June issue of Por la Libertad (For Freedom), the bulletin of CODDEH.]

* * *

Question: What is the state of your case?

Answer: The 25-year prison sentence handed down by the Consejo de Guerra de la III Zona Judicial de Policía [the Military Tribunal of the Third Police Judicial District] was confirmed by the Consejo Supremo de Justicia Militar [the High Tribunal of Military Justice].

According to the unconstitutional legal code instituted by the armed forces, this sentence cannot be appealed since the Consejo Supremo de Justicia Militar has been elevated to a rank coequal with that of the Corte Suprema de Justicia [the Supreme Court]. Of course, the events for which I was tried occurred before this code existed; therefore, according to the principle of the nonretroactivity of laws, I should have the right to appeal to the Corte Suprema. However, the law of the military is the law of the saber; and even their own bourgeois law has no validity against it.

Q: What is the situation of the peasants tried with you?

A: After long years in prison including torture, the greater part of them have been set free. Compañero Basilio Alvarez, however, is still a prisoner along with me.

Most ordinary prisoners are granted parole when they complete two-thirds of their sentence. My comrades were denied this right.

Q: What are the conditions of life like on El Frontón?

A: Inhuman, as in all Peruvian prisons. The worst aspects are the lack of unpolluted drinking water, the open sewers, and an "infirmary" without doctors or medicines, where you only go to catch more diseases in the filthiest beds on the island.

Q: In your judgment what are the

tasks that CODDEH must undertake in the next months?

A: I think the most urgent task, more pressing even than the fight for a general amnesty, is to demand an explanation of the whereabouts of Enrique Amaya Quintana.

We must not allow the Peruvian people to be hardened by letting them get used to disappearances like those of Lobatón, Cutipa, etc.*

It seems to me that the case of Amaya is the most scandalous and must serve as the symbol for the fight of the Comité por Defensa de los Derechos Humanos. How can we hope that the bourgeois government will grant a general amnesty in an atmosphere where cases like Amaya's can pass almost unnoticed?

I think that the Comité de Defensa de los Derechos Humanos must wage an intensive campaign, appealing to organizations and individuals nationally and internationally to take a stand exclusively on this case.

In this "Year of Human Rights," political parties and trade unions of both the left and right, religious and cultural organizations, priests, candidates for public office, and all sorts of persons must say what they think about this monstrous crime. An intensive continuing campaign must be waged, with meetings in every neighborhood, with protest strikes, etc.

Unfortunately the weight of the committee's work falls on the shoulders of a limited number of persons, and this must not continue. Some of the organizations which have joined the committee must realize that formal affiliation is not enough. The unions, student federations, and political parties must contribute activists for these urgent tasks.

*Benito Cutipa, a peasant leader from the Valle de la Convención and a member of the guerrilla force commanded by Luis de la Puente Uceda, was captured by soldiers in the vicinity of the La Joya ranch. The daily newspapers in Lima even published extensive reports on the capture of "an important guerrilla." However, this peasant leader was never heard from again and not even his family have gotten any accounting of his whereabouts. As Blanco said, Cutipa's case is one of many "disappearances" of political prisoners in our country.

FIDEL CASTRO'S SPEECH ON THE SOVIET OCCUPATION OF CZECHOSLOVAKIA

[Continued from last week.]

We are witnessing many interesting things resulting from these events.

It is understandable that the countries of the Warsaw Pact sent their armies to destroy the imperialist conspiracy and the progress of counterrevolution in Czechoslovakia. However, we have disagreed with, been displeased at, and protested against the fact that these same countries have been drawing closer economically, culturally and politically to the oligarchic governments of Latin America, which are not merely reactionary governments and exploiters of their peoples, but also shameless accomplices in the imperialist aggressions against Cuba and shameless accomplices in the economic blockade of Cuba. And these countries have been encouraged and emboldened by the fact that our friends, our natural allies, have ignored the vile and treacherous role enacted by those governments against a socialist country, the policy of blockade practiced by those countries against a socialist country.

And at the same time that we understand the need for the spirit of internationalism, and the need to go to the aid -- even with troops -- of a fraternal country to confront the schemes of the imperialists, we ask ourselves if that policy of economic, political and cultural rapprochement toward those oligarchic governments that are accomplices in the imperialist blockade against Cuba will come to an end.

In the face of this situation, it is well to see now how these countries react.

It says: "The whole Latin American bloc in the forum of the nations of the world expressed its unanimous repudiation of this Russian intervention in Czechoslovakia. A spokesman for the group said, 'We all received the news of this intervention with sorrow, and we express our solidarity with the Czechoslovaks.'

"The political consequences which this Soviet intrusion in the internal affairs of Czechoslovakia will have will be the strengthening of the anti-Soviet tendency in Latin America,' the spokesman said," etc.

And then it said: "The source said

this Soviet attitude, the theory of spheres of influence which they themselves have so often criticized, would make it possible for the United States to assume the right to invade Cuba, since it is within its security area."

These puppet governments have already begun to prepare the theory that Cuba must be invaded, because it is within their security area. And it is these countries -- with the single exception of Mexico, whose government is the only one which has not participated in the blockade, aggressions and imperialist actions against Cuba -- it is all these oligarchic governments, toward which they have shown great consideration and tact, which are the ring-leaders in the United Nations of the clamor and the attacks on the socialist camp over the events in Czechoslovakia. Things have even gone so far as for these same countries of the Latin-American bloc to propose a meeting of the General Assembly; they are the most rabid critics of the Soviet Union and the other countries of the socialist camp as a result of these events. And these are the countries which have been accomplices in the aggressions against Cuba; countries which have no moral right to talk about interventions, because they have been accomplices in all the crimes committed by imperialism against the peoples, such as the brutal counterrevolutionary action perpetrated in the Dominican Republic, the aggressions against Cuba and many other countries and the aggressions against other peoples in Latin America. The oligarchic governments themselves, such as those of Brazil, Paraguay and other countries, sent troops to the Dominican Republic and are now leading the attack on and the condemnation of the socialist camp for the events in Czechoslovakia.

What magnificent reasoning and how this reveals the correctness of the positions taken by the Cuban revolution in relation to these events!

And we also wonder whether that policy will be rectified or whether it will be continued along the path of political, economic and cultural rapprochement with those countries.

One of them, Argentina, even shelled a Soviet fishing vessel -- shelled it! I believe they even wounded one of the members of the vessel's crew. Afterwards they were like beasts over there, lying in wait for another boat. They commit flagrant, indecent actions against everybody, yet that soft line has been followed in regard to them -- a line which, in our opinion, only en-

courages their position as accomplices in the aggressions against Cuba.

There is a most interesting news dispatch here which says: "Caracas, August 21 -- Venezuela has decided to suspend its talks with the Soviet Union and the Communist bloc in relation to the resumption of diplomatic relations in protest against the invasion of Czechoslovakia.

"The announcement was made by Foreign Minister Ignacio Iribarren Borges at a press conference. The statement reads textually:

"In view of the news of the invasion of Czechoslovakia by troops of the Soviet Union and other Eastern European countries, the government of Venezuela maintains that this action against the sovereignty and territorial integrity of that country constitutes an open violation of the principles of nonaggression and self-determination of the peoples contained in the United Nations Charter and the principles of nonintervention formulated in Resolution 2131 of the General Assembly and invariably defended by Venezuela.

"The events which have taken place are a source of grave concern to the Venezuelan government, since they constitute a violation of the legal international order, a brazen use of superior force and a serious setback for the aspirations for peaceful coexistence among the peoples.

"The Venezuelan government considers that the invading troops should immediately and unconditionally withdraw.

"The government of Venezuela voices the feeling of the Venezuelan people in expressing its profound solidarity and sympathy with the Czechoslovak people."

None of these statements were made, none of these attitudes were voiced, none of these issues were brought up by the Venezuelan government during the landing of Yankee forces in the Dominican Republic.

No relations were broken, no business was shelved, no economic relations were disturbed -- nothing at all like this happened. And now they permit themselves the luxury of throwing in the face of the countries of the socialist camp this type of relations which the latter have actually been begging them for, this type of relations which they have been begging that government, which is one of the most reactionary and dyed-in-the-wool of the accomplices of Yankee imperialism. And now they throw it in the faces of the socialist countries.

These are the results of such a policy when the chips are down, at the moment of truth.

Something similar is happening to the Communist parties of Europe, today trapped in their own indecision. And we wonder whether possibly in the future the relations with Communist parties will be based on principled positions or whether they will continue to be guided by their degree of willingness to maintain a spineless attitude, to be satellites, lackeys -- a situation in which only those that maintain a spineless attitude, say "Yes" to everything and never assume an independent position on anything, would be considered friendly.

So there you have those who criticized us on innumerable occasions, today overwhelmed by the worst kind of confusion.

Our party did not hesitate to help the Venezuelan guerrillas when a rightist and treacherous leadership, betraying the revolutionary line, abandoned the guerrillas and entered into shameless collusion with the regime. At that time we presented our analysis as to which side was right -- that scheming, politicking group that betrayed the combatants, that betrayed those who had given their lives, or those who kept the flag of rebellion flying. We did not take into consideration the number of the rightist group; we took into consideration where right lay. We did not take into consideration how many members of the Central Committee or the Political Bureau were involved, because right does not necessarily equate with numbers.

And at that time the revolutionaries who remained aloft the banner of guerrilla struggle were in the minority. And we maintained the same position we hold today when we supported the guerrillas over and above the rightist leadership of Venezuela, when, for the same reason, we supported the Guatemalan guerrillas against the treachery and scheming of the rightist leadership in Guatemala, when we backed the Bolivian guerrillas against the schemes and betrayal of the rightist leadership in Bolivia. Yet we were accused of being adventurers, of interfering in the affairs of other countries, of interfering in the affairs of other parties.

I ask myself, in the light of the facts and in the light of the bitter reality that persuaded the nations of the Warsaw Pact to send their forces to crush the counterrevolution in Czechoslovakia, and -- according to their statement -- to back a minority in the face of a majority with rightist positions, if they will also cease to support these rightist, reformist, sold-out, submissive leaderships in Latin America that are enemies of the

armed revolutionary struggle, that oppose the peoples' liberation struggle.

And, with the example of this bitter experience before them, I wonder whether or not the parties of those countries, in line with the decision made in Czechoslovakia, will cease to support those rightist groups that betray the revolutionary movement in Latin America.

Certainly, we do not believe in the possibility of an improvement in relations between the socialist camp and imperialism under the present conditions, or under any conditions as long as that imperialism exists. We do not and cannot believe in the possibility of an improvement in relations between the socialist camp and the U.S. imperialist government as long as that country performs the role of international gendarme, aggressor against the peoples and enemy and systematic opponent of revolutions everywhere in the world. Much less can we believe in any such improvement in the midst of an aggression as criminal and cowardly as that being waged against Vietnam.

Our position on this is very clear: one is consistent with world realities and is truly internationalist and genuinely and decidedly supports the revolutionary movement throughout the world, in which case relations with the imperialist government of the United States cannot be improved, or relations with the imperialist U.S. government will improve, but only at the cost of withholding consistent support from the worldwide revolutionary movement.

This is our thesis, this is our position.

I have here a dispatch datelined Washington, August 22: "Soviet intervention in Czechoslovakia compromises any improvement in relation between East and West, U.S. Secretary of State Dean Rusk stated today.

"The situation created could block ratification of the Nonproliferation Treaty by the U.S. Senate, he added.

"The U.S. chief diplomat made this statement to the press on leaving a White House cabinet meeting in which the problem of Czechoslovakia and the Vietnam situation were discussed."

This can hardly fail to delight us. Our people know the position of the Cuban delegation regarding this famous Nonproliferation Treaty, which virtually gives a permanent concession to the large powers for the monopoly of nuclear weapons and the monopoly of technology in a field of energy that is going to be indispensable to the future of mankind. We were concerned, above all, by the fact that

many countries of the world, including our own, would be obliged to accept the U.S. imperialist government's monopoly on those weapons, which could be used at any moment against any people, particularly in view of the fact that the proposed treaty was also accompanied by an astonishing declaration concerning the defense of the signatory nation that might be threatened with nuclear weapons.

Such countries as Vietnam, countries such as Cuba, that did not choose to accept that type of treaty, and much less sign it in a situation in which the aggression against Vietnam is being constantly intensified, are left outside the realm of any protection, and thus fall into the category in which the imperialists would theoretically have the right to attack us with nuclear arms. And of course everyone knows our position.

In view of the facts, in the face of an imperialism that is always plotting, always conspiring against the socialist camp, we ask ourselves whether or not the idyllic hopes of an improvement in relations with the imperialist government of the United States will continue to be maintained. We ask ourselves if, consistent with events in Czechoslovakia, a position may be adopted that will imply a renunciation of such idyllic hopes in relation to Yankee imperialism. And the dispatch states that an improvement in relations will be compromised and that there is the danger of nonratification of the treaty. In our opinion, that would be the best thing that could happen.

Now then, these are, in our opinion, the two most important questions. The TASS statement explaining the decision of the Warsaw Pact governments states in its concluding paragraph:

"The fraternal countries firmly and resolutely offer their unbreakable solidarity against any outside threat. They will never permit anyone to tear away even one link of the community of socialist states."

And we ask ourselves: "Does that declaration include Vietnam? Does that statement include Korea? Does that statement include Cuba? Do they or do they not consider Vietnam, Korea and Cuba links of the socialist camp to be safeguarded against the imperialists?"

In accordance with that declaration, Warsaw Pact divisions were sent into Czechoslovakia. And we ask ourselves: "Will Warsaw Pact divisions also be sent to Vietnam if the Yankee imperialists step up their aggression against that country and the people of Vietnam request that aid? Will they send the divisions of the Warsaw Pact to the Democratic People's Republic of Korea if the Yankee imperialists attack

that country? Will they send the divisions of the Warsaw Pact to Cuba if the Yankee imperialists attack our country, or even in the case of the threat of a Yankee imperialist attack on our country, if our country requests it?" (Prolonged applause.)

We acknowledge the bitter necessity that called for the sending of those forces into Czechoslovakia; we do not condemn the socialist countries that made that decision. But we, as revolutionaries, and proceeding from positions of principle, do have the right to demand that they adopt a consistent position with regard to all the other questions that affect the world revolutionary movement.

There is no reason to hide the fact that great danger confronts our country. The advocates of an armed aggression against Cuba are all out rubbing their hands with glee. Only today a new dispatch came in calling for just that.

We must state how we see these questions. Is it perhaps a matter of the principle of sovereignty? Has it by chance been a law that has protected and protects our country from a Yankee invasion? Nobody believes that. If it were a matter of law, if it were the principle of sovereignty that had to protect our country, the revolution would have disappeared from the face of the earth long ago. What has protected this revolution, what has made it possible, has been the blood shed by the sons of this people, the blood shed fighting against Batista's thugs and armies, the blood shed fighting against the mercenaries, the determination that exists here to die to the last man in the defense of the revolution that was demonstrated in the October crisis, the imperialists' knowledge that they could never stage a maneuverlike military pushover here.

What defends this revolution is not an abstract, internationally recognized legal principle.

This revolution is defended by the unity of our people, their revolutionary awareness, their readiness for combat, their decision to die to the last man in defense of the revolution and our country!

I don't believe that even our enemies have any doubts as to this people's courage and spirit. What defends the sovereignty of a country, what defends a just cause, is a people capable of feeling that cause as its own, of cherishing a deep conviction as to the justice of that cause and the decision to defend it at any price. That is precisely what protects our revolution and what protects the sovereignty of our country in the face of the imperialist threat that has always existed here.

The imperialists have not given up for one instant their dream of destroying our country. Those dangers will naturally increase now. Therefore, now, precisely now -- because things must be spoken of at the right time -- we are once more going to explain what our position is, the position of our revolutionary government, regarding the United States. And we state it now, precisely when speaking out has very real significance and is not simply declamatory or theoretical, and we state it with all the more reason because of certain speculations that have been circulated concerning a possible bettering of relations between Cuba and the United States.

The revolutionary government has at no time shown the slightest interest in bettering its relations with the imperialist government of the United States; it has not shown it and it will not show it, nor will it give it the slightest attention or express directly or indirectly, tacitly or openly, any kind of willingness to hold conversations with that government as long as that government remains the international gendarme, bulwark of world reaction, enemy of the revolutionary movements, aggressor in Vietnam, aggressor in the Dominican Republic, and intervener in revolutionary movements. This has been, is, and will unquestionably continue to be the position of the revolutionary government of Cuba.

Never, under any circumstance -- and the comrades of our Central Committee know this; they know that this is the line adopted by our committee -- never, under any circumstance, even in the most difficult circumstances, will this country approach the imperialist government of the United States -- not even should it one day place us in the situation of having to choose between the continued existence of the revolution or such a step. Because, gentlemen, that would be the moment at which the revolution would have ceased to exist.

And if the day should ever come when this revolution had to buy its security and its survival at the price of some concession to the Yankee imperialists, we would prefer -- as our Central Committee unanimously would prefer and as our people would prefer -- this people to disappear with the revolution rather than survive at such a price! (Prolonged applause.)

In the United States there are honest people, progressive people who oppose the blockades, the aggressions, all these things. Naturally we have always had a friendly attitude toward those who honestly maintain those positions; people who oppose the war in Vietnam, people who oppose the imperialist policy of the United States.

But regarding the government of that country, our position is absolutely and unmistakably clear: we are not interested in economic relations, and we are even less interested in diplomatic relations of any kind.

They have been carrying out their criminal blockade for ten years. They taught us to find the way to defend ourselves against this; they taught us to forge a revolutionary awareness. They know by now that it will not be easy to crush us, that we are not going to shrink from their threats or yield to them and that it will not be easy to starve us to death under any circumstance.

We have struggled forward in these ten years by making enormous efforts. The time is not far off when we will begin to receive the fruits of these efforts. Very well: we are prepared to go on for twenty years, or a lifetime, without any relations whatsoever with them. And we repeat: under whatever circumstances! That is, we shall wait until Yankee imperialism ceases to be Yankee imperialism. And we shall have enough patience and sufficient tenacity to persevere as long as may be necessary. That is our position. And we believe that this alone can be the true revolutionary position.

We know they will attempt to intimidate us. They will not succeed. They will find it very difficult to instill fear here, to frighten this country, because this country has learned in the last ten years how to live face to face with this enemy, confronting this enemy's threats.

And we are sincere when we say that we prefer plain speaking. We even prefer a position which involves risks to those indefinite situations which could encourage a slackening in our combat preparedness.

We have not had a combat alert for some time. There has not been a really tense situation for some time. Now, since these recent developments, some news agencies have reported that our forces had been placed in a state of partial alert. Yes, immediately! Our forces can never be taken by surprise.

Our philosophy of struggle includes a series of fundamental concepts: they will never catch us off guard! We prefer to have too many alerts to being taken by surprise. And we have always -- under all circumstances -- been prepared, all our forces in a state of alert, to avoid the possibility of surprise.

Our philosophy is well known: here the order to open fire will never need to be given, for this order is always in effect. Always! There is no need to give

the order, it is unnecessary. No one will ever enter this country against our will. And the circumstances will never arise in which anyone could enter here without encountering fierce and implacable combat from the first moment. There is no need to give the order to open fire!

Nor will the order to "cease fire" ever be given in case of an aggression! We will never accept any form of surrender!

These are three fundamental concepts of our philosophy, right here under the very nose of Yankee imperialism. And all our people are imbued with this philosophy and are calmly determined to lay down their lives to the last man. That is also part of our philosophy.

Men have to die, one way or another. The one sad way to die is to die in shame, with one's back to the enemy.

We are not in favor of war, but revolutionaries would rather die in battle than as the result of natural causes. Naturally, we are not going to provoke wars just to avoid death by natural causes. Revolutionaries cannot always do what they want to do or whatever pleases them the most, for their duty will always come first and foremost.

As a matter of fact, all of our people are well aware of this -- no one has the slightest doubt about it -- and that is what really defends our sovereignty.

The imperialists will begin by threatening us. The future will be much more entertaining than the past. We will never halt our work or our development plans. The enemy will not succeed even in this. Our present level of organization will help us carry out our plans. We will carry these plans ahead, strengthen our defenses and step up our combat training.

Well, here comes the first one: a news dispatch from Brazil, quoting a newspaper which is a spokesman for the oligarchy.

The dispatch reads: "'The Soviet intervention in an internal affair of Czechoslovakia reopens the Cuban question which seemed to have been closed and forgotten.' This is the opening statement in a long editorial published yesterday by Jornal do Brasil.

"The newspaper, in a commentary entitled 'There and Here,' says textually:

"'After the entry of Russian troops into Czechoslovak territory several issues concerning the world's balance of power should be automatically reevaluated.

"'One cannot help but recognize that now the presence of Cuba takes on an-

other meaning in the light of the cold and brutal reality that caused the Soviet Union to feel insecure simply because a country in the Communist orbit considered it necessary to indulge in a debate over freedom. Moscow's intolerance did not hesitate in brushing aside order in favor of brute force.

"If the USSR can besmirch the principle of the peoples' self-determination, considering Czechoslovakia a common territory under her ideological jurisdiction, the same doctrine cannot be invoked to prevent the Cuban case from being considered in the light of specific interests of continental unity.

"There are well-known differences between these two cases. In the first place, Czechoslovakia did not break with the principles of socialism, nor did she politically oppose the bloc to which she belongs. Only internally did she abolish the rigidity of the stifling dictatorship and drift toward a debate in which the word "freedom" came to be considered as a dimension without which socialism is a hoax.

"The situation of Cuba is quite different: the Havana government is not in harmony with the group of continental countries, whose commitments are to democracy and freedom. The Communist regime of Havana, in addition to being an exception, arrogates to itself the mission of exporting subversion to the point of financing groups which disturb the democratic order in Latin America.

"As long as the Soviet Union was capable of allowing the winds of freedom to sweep through Czechoslovakia, the world was under the impression that finally the major powers, the leaders of blocs, were taking a more tolerant attitude rather than resorting automatically to military intervention. But the scene was unexpectedly and brutally altered. The weight of Soviet violence fell on the Czechoslo-

vak attempt to try out freedom.

"The situation changes automatically in respect to Cuba, not as a result of any compensation, but by the mere fact that it is necessary to reevaluate the balance of forces on the world scene. The Cuban problem will be reopened, and Brazil, which aligned itself in the defense of the principle of nonintervention, will have to bear in mind that the Rio de Janeiro Treaty is the document on which to base the reexamination of the problem.

"As of yesterday morning, the Cuban question, therefore, has become a current issue and calls for reconsideration without the mistaken connotations which caused it to be viewed unrealistically. The Soviet aggression against Europe exposes its flank in Latin America to an inevitable examination," concludes the editorial contained in yesterday's issue of Jornal do Brasil (August 22)."

And they try to say this is a realistic examination!

There is a slight difference, gentlemen of Jornal do Brasil and the rest of the oligarchs, and that is that in a few hours we Cuban revolutionaries would throw the best divisions of Brazil out of Cuba with a swift kick in the pants. (Applause.)

And against the best divisions of the imperialist government of the United States we are willing, like the Vietnamese, to fight for one hundred years, if necessary. (Applause.)

That is the only slight difference, imperialists and oligarchs. We gladly uphold our positions, and we will uphold them always without being frightened by any kind of threats.

Patria o Muerte! Venceremos! (Ovation.)

[End.]

HANOI OFFICIALLY SUPPORTS KREMLIN'S ACTION IN CZECHOSLOVAKIA

In a short statement reported in the September 4 issue of the Paris daily Le Monde, Premier Pham Van Dong finally made it official that North Vietnam does support Moscow's moves in Czechoslovakia.

"It is clear," he said, "that a serious danger threatened socialist Czechoslovakia. The American imperialists and the West German retaliationists feverishly intervened in Czechoslovak affairs, in collusion with Czechoslovak counterrevolutionaries, in order to convert Czechoslovakia into a capitalist country dependent

on the West, thus constituting a danger to the security of the Warsaw Pact countries and to peace in Europe and the world.

"The threat, which bore on the very existence of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, necessitated the Soviet Union and four other socialist countries taking all measures, including the employment of armed force, in order to defeat the intervention of the American imperialists and West German retaliationists, accomplices of the Czechoslovak counterrevolutionaries."

CEYLONESE TROTSKYISTS SCORE STALINIST MOVE AGAINST CZECHOSLOVAKS

[The following declaration was released to the press August 26 by the Lanka Sama Samaja party (Revolutionary), the Ceylonese section of the Fourth International.]

* * *

When armed forces of the Soviet Union, in association with similar forces of four other states belonging to the "Soviet bloc" in Eastern Europe, invaded the territory of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic on the night of 20 August, 1968, they not only trampled on the independence of the people of Czechoslovakia but shattered whatever illusions people in other countries may have had as to the so-called de-Stalinisation process in the Soviet Union after the death of Stalin.

The invasion has confirmed, on the twenty-eighth anniversary of the murderous attack made by a Stalinist assassin on Leon Trotsky, the founder of the Fourth International, the correctness of Trotsky's characterisation of Stalinism as a caricature of Marxism, which gives expression not to the revolutionary socialist interests of the proletariat and the oppressed peoples of the world, as Marxism does, but to the narrow interests of the bureaucracy that usurped political power in the Soviet Union after the death of Lenin.

The pretext given in the official Soviet newspaper Pravda for the flagrant use of armed force against a workers state allied to the Soviet Union is that "the leaders of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic had done nothing to rebuff counterrevolution."

This typical Stalinist slander of political dissentients within the Communist movement itself has not been accepted as a justification for the invasion even by the big Communist parties of France and Italy, nor by smaller Communist parties, like those of Britain and Japan. Their public criticism of the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia proves that even the leaders of Communist parties that have hitherto defended the foreign policy of the Soviet government, through all its twists and turns, find it impossible today to defend this latest manifestation of that policy.

The reaction of the U.S. imperialist government in Washington to the invasion is most illuminating. Whilst condemning the "perfidy" of the Soviet Union, the U.S. State Department has "stressed" that the Soviet invasion "has a negative effect on bilateral relations between

Washington and Moscow, but this must not lead to abandonment of efforts to resolve other problems with the Kremlin."

This statement shows that whilst the U.S. imperialists consider South Vietnam to be within their sphere of influence, they treat Czechoslovakia as being within the sphere of influence of the Soviet Union, in accordance with the Yalta agreement between U.S. imperialism and its allies and the Stalinist bureaucracy of the Soviet Union, that was concluded while the Second World War was drawing to an end.

Whilst the suppression of the independence of the people of Czechoslovakia is tragic for them, it only brings closer the day when the growth of contradictions within the Soviet Union itself between the interests of the masses of its people and those of the Soviet bureaucracy would make necessary a political revolution, which Trotsky predicted and called for, for the restoration of genuine proletarian socialist democracy within the Soviet Union.

The people of Czechoslovakia have already given their answer to the armed occupation of their country with a protest general strike and direct demands to the occupying forces to withdraw.

Furthermore, despite the armed occupation, the Communist party of Czechoslovakia has held a party congress, which has confirmed its confidence in its present leadership and its determination to follow the policy of democratisation that the Stalinist bosses in the Kremlin seek to prevent. The congress has demanded the immediate ending of the occupation and the release of all Czechoslovak leaders who have been arrested and detained by the occupation forces.

The LSSP(R) unconditionally endorses these demands and declares that it is the duty of all genuine fighters for socialism, as well as all those who stand for the right of self-determination of all nations, big or small, to support these demands before the Ceylonese people.

Our people have to add to the continuing demand for the unconditional withdrawal of the armed forces of the United States and its allies from Vietnam the demand for the unconditional withdrawal of the armed forces of the Soviet Union and its allies from Czechoslovakia.

FOURTH INTERNATIONAL CRITICIZES FIDEL CASTRO'S POSITION ON CZECHOSLOVAKIA

[The following statement was issued September 1 by the United Secretariat of the Fourth International.]

* * *

In categorically rejecting Fidel Castro's endorsement of the invasion of Czechoslovakia by Soviet and other troops, the United Secretariat of the Fourth International undoubtedly expressed the opinion not only of the international Trotskyist movement but also of the very great majority of militants who have defended socialist Cuba most resolutely.

In his statement, Fidel Castro argues for his position essentially as follows: (a) There was a danger of capitalist restoration in Czechoslovakia. (b) This danger was produced and fostered by the erroneous policies not only of the Czechs but of the Soviets themselves. (c) The appeal made by Czechoslovak "top personalities" for help cannot be advanced as a valid basic reason for intervening; "the sole justification can only be the simple political fact that Czechoslovakia was moving toward a counterrevolutionary situation and that this seriously affected the entire socialist community." (d) Castro raised the question whether this intervention marked the beginning of a rectification in Soviet policy which would be expressed in its defense of Vietnam and Cuba, etc.

The United Secretariat of the Fourth International has shown in other documents that there was no danger of capitalist restoration in Czechoslovakia. A right-wing course, even a reactionary international policy, as for example Yugoslavia's policy toward several countries in Latin America, cannot be equated with the danger of capitalist restoration. Such a danger can only arise from social forces having the capacity to organize themselves sufficiently to impose the re-establishment of capitalist private ownership by force -- which was not at all the case in Czechoslovakia.

To the contrary, the Czechoslovak masses as a whole are dedicated to maintaining and developing the forms of collective ownership. These masses mobilized to transform the "liberalizing" course introduced after the elimination of Novotny into a course culminating in real socialist democracy.

Defense of the "socialist camp" was not what made the Soviet government act but its fear that the antibureaucratic upsurge in Czechoslovakia would be echoed in the other workers states, including, most importantly, the Soviet Union itself.

There was no rectification of the Soviet policy toward American imperialism in this intervention. It was carried out with the assurance that the American government would regard it as the expression of the policy of a great power striving to maintain "order" in its sphere, and would limit itself to propagandistic condemnations -- that it would do nothing to increase international tension and would continue seeking partial agreements with Moscow, for example in regard to nuclear armaments.

Washington exploited the invasion of Czechoslovakia to "justify" its own aggressions; and the Soviet intervention dealt a blow to the movements throughout the world against the imperialist aggression in Vietnam.

The United Secretariat of the Fourth International draws attention to the fact that among the few Communist parties supporting the Soviet invasion are the Latin-American parties which, as Fidel Castro well knows, are sabotaging the revolutionary struggle on that continent. It is the Escalantes of all these countries who endorsed their Kremlin bosses.

The Soviet government's propaganda about an appeal from a group of Czechoslovak party and state leaders cannot be minimized. One can be certain that in case of a real threat of capitalist restoration in a workers state, the great majority of workers and especially the Communists would be mobilized to counter this danger and would, if they thought it necessary, openly call for military aid. Cuba's example is eloquent in this regard. But in no case can it be accepted that the government of a workers state has the right to decide on a military intervention in another workers state behind the backs and against the wishes of the great majority, if not all the workers, in that country.

Furthermore, this "justification" advanced by the Kremlin shows how much the Soviet leaders are abusing the Soviet masses themselves in the first instance.

While rejecting the position Fidel Castro has taken on the Czechoslovak events, the United Secretariat of the Fourth International reminds the international Trotskyist movement, all revolutionary militants, and the working masses that their tasks of solidarity toward the workers of Czechoslovakia must in no way lead them to slacken in defending socialist Cuba against the blockade, the machinations, and the threats of American imperialism; in advancing the OLAS line in Latin America, and in defending the Vietnamese revolution more vigorously than ever against American aggression.

THE U.S. COMMUNIST PARTY STRADDLES RIGHT DOWN THE MIDDLE

When the news came over the radio that Soviet tanks had rolled into Prague, the first reaction of the Gus Hall leadership of the Communist party of the USA was to heartily approve the Kremlin's intervention in the internal affairs of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic.

There were some rumblings in the ranks of the party, however, over such a forthright stand, and several prominent leaders took a different position publicly, indicating that there might be deep divisions in the party over Moscow's decision to crush the threat of socialist democracy in Czechoslovakia in the egg.

The top leadership met in New York to thresh out the question. After three days threshing, they came up with a very neat solution -- instead of splitting down the middle, they decided to straddle down the middle. On September 3, they issued the following statement:

"The National Committee associates itself with the statement of Aug. 22 by Gus Hall, general secretary, CPUSA, issued in accord with a decision of the National Secretariat of the Party on that date.

"The National Committee welcomes the new possibilities that have now opened up for a quick resolution of this crisis.

"As we see it, the path to that resolution and the normalization of life in Czechoslovakia is along the following lines: (1) Curbing of the activities of all counterrevolutionary forces that endangered the socialist society of Czechoslovakia.

"(2) Immediate steps to continue the processes of socialist democratization and economic reforms that were set in motion at the January meeting of the

Communist Party of Czechoslovakia.

"(3) The taking of all necessary measures for the safety of the borders between Czechoslovakia and West Germany.

"(4) A speedy normalization of all phases of domestic life in Czechoslovakia.

"(5) Closing of the ranks of the world socialist family -- of all forces of anti-imperialism -- for defense against imperialist encroachment, for the waging of an offensive against world imperialism.

"We welcome the agreement speedily to withdraw the military forces of the Warsaw Pact socialist countries from Czechoslovakia."

Arnold Johnson, the party's national public relations director, commented as follows:

"The National Committee adopted its policy statement by a vote of 61 in favor, seven against and four abstaining. This is abundant proof that the report circulated by the Associated Press that the Communist party was split down the middle was completely false and malicious. On the contrary, the adoption of the statement, as well as the vote of 60 in support of the major report given by Gus Hall, and the whole process of discussion in the National Committee strengthened the unity of the Communist party."

Thus the Gus Hall team can point with pride to the example they have set for the entire Stalinist world on how to (1) support the struggle of the Czechoslovak people for "socialist democratization and economic reforms"; (2) at the very same time support the Kremlin's blitzkrieg to crush that struggle; and (3) strike a memorable blow for peaceful co-existence and the unity of one and all.

ERNEST MANDEL SPEAKS AT SOCIALIST SCHOLARS CONFERENCE

Ernest Mandel, the noted Marxist economist and editor of the Belgian left socialist weekly, La Gauche, began a two-month speaking tour of the United States by presenting two talks to the three-day Socialist Scholars Conference held September 6-8 at Rutgers University, New Brunswick, New Jersey. He was the principal invited foreign guest at this fourth annual gathering of radical American intellectuals.

The central theme of the conference was "The Socialist Perspective in

the Advanced Countries." At the Friday evening dinner on the first day of the sessions, Mandel, as an eyewitness of the revolutionary events in France this spring, made a comprehensive analysis of the May-June upheaval.

Mandel cited the massive and spontaneous general strike in France as forceful and convincing evidence that a socialist revolution is possible in the advanced industrial countries of the West. Even though the workers did not take power this time in France, they evinced

enough readiness to do so and would have gone farther and faster in that direction if the Communist party and General Federation of Labor [CGT] leaderships had not barred the road.

He concluded by pointing to the momentous expansion of personal freedom during the upheaval. "Never have the French people been or felt so free as they were in May and June," he said. "They felt free to speak, assemble, discuss. The struggle in France extended all personal individual freedoms. Freedom is a powerful weapon for socialism. A socialist society in the West will be a thousand times freer than anything known under capitalism." The audience of more than 400 rose to a standing ovation.

The following morning Mandel presented a paper on "The Working Class Under Neocapitalism." After analyzing the basic trends of contemporary capitalism, he concluded:

"Neocapitalism in the long run strengthens the working class as much as did laissez-faire capitalism or monopoly capitalism in its first stage. Historically, it makes the working class grow both numerically and in respect to its vital

role in the economy. It thereby strengthens the latent power of the working class and underlines its potential capacity to overthrow capitalism and to reconstruct society on the basis of its own socialist ideal."

At a lively panel on "The New Student Movement," Gisela Mandel sketched the development of the Sozialistischer Deutscher Studentenbund [Socialist German Student Union -- SDS].

The other panels which attracted the most sizable audiences were those on "The Role of Intellectuals in Social Change," "Black Power and Socialism," and "The Preconditions for a Mass Socialist Party in the United States."

Ernest and Gisela Mandel will be speaking at leading universities throughout the United States and Canada during late September and October. Among them are the State University of New York at Binghamton, LaValle U. at Montreal, University of Toronto, U. of Pittsburgh, Wayne State University in Detroit, Florida State University, University of California at Berkeley and Riverside, Swarthmore, University of Pennsylvania, and Columbia University in New York.

In this issue

	<u>Page</u>
DRAWING: Alexander Dubček	745
How Moscow Initiated Negotiations with Dubček as an "Equal"	746
Czechoslovak Memorandum on the Fourteen-Point "Agreement"	746
Defense to Appeal Conviction of Black Panther Leader	747
French CP Squirms over Czechoslovakia	748
Antiwar Struggle in Japan: An Interview with Narita Farmers -- by Fred Halstead	752
Maurice Spector -- Pioneer Canadian Trotskyist -- by Ross Dowson	753
Czechoslovak Stand Brings Reprisal on Luxembourg CP Councilors	754
Louis Aragon Demands Immediate End to Soviet Occupation	755
Johnson Uses Czechoslovakia as Excuse to Heat Up the Cold War	756
Czechoslovak Crisis Deepens Split in Greek Communist Party	756
DRAWING: Clark Clifford	756
Stokely Carmichael Speaks at Arab Student Convention -- by Jan Garrett	757
DRAWING: Stokely Carmichael	757
An Interview with Hugo Blanco in El Frontón Prison	758
Fidel Castro's Speech on the Soviet Occupation of Czechoslovakia -- Part III	759
Hanoi Officially Supports Kremlin's Action in Czechoslovakia	764
Documents:	
The Maoist Position on the Soviet Blow Against Czechoslovakia	750
Ceylonese Trotskyists Score Stalinist Move Against Czechoslovaks	765
Fourth International Criticizes Fidel Castro's Position on Czechoslovakia [Statement by the United Secretariat of the Fourth International]	766
The U.S. Communist Party Straddles Right Down the Middle	767
Ernest Mandel Speaks at Socialist Scholars Conference	767